



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In view of the mistakes of the past and of the dangers which threaten us, it is plain that it would be arrant folly to refuse to carry out in full the suggestions of the general staff of the army, and the recommendations of the general board of the navy, of which Dewey is the head, which have just been made public. For, however much these will cost, that cost can be but as nothing to the huge price that we shall have to pay in life, devastation and money for our negligence, should our invasion occur.

That preparedness has its ethical side, John Fiske has shown. He has said that the closest approach to a condition of perpetual and universal peace that it is possible to attain among nations can be achieved only when the preponderance of military power has been gathered into the hands of the pacific peoples. It is obvious that our own form of civilization as well as the forms of civilization enjoyed by the other pacific nations are in jeopardy, so long as the machinery of compulsion remains wholly in the hands of those bent upon conquest. So it is apparent that humanity and the preservation of righteousness throughout the world, no less than our own security, require that we shall do our part to redress the balance of power which too long has been permitted to lie with the war-like nations.<sup>1</sup>

## THE LOGIC OF PHYSICAL AND MENTAL PREPAREDNESS

By NEWELL B. WOODWORTH, A.M.

PRESIDENT-GENERAL, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THE first chapter of American democracy commenced with the Continental Congress and the shots of the "Minute Men" at Lexington and Concord, and ended at Yorktown. Now, after more than a century and a quarter has passed, the deeper meaning of October 19, 1781, can be seen more clearly. Then it was only the eager rejoicing over a great victory that had been achieved after many depressing months, during which the cause of liberty seemed destined to defeat. Now it is seen as a momentous event upon which was to be predicated the Treaty of Paris, which was to give the opportunity for the development of the greatest representative government the world has ever known—a government standing for the highest ideals of individual liberty and equality and of national and international rights of humanity. Thus, through the intervening years since Cornwallis capitulated, a greater responsibility has been developing, as the nation has

<sup>1</sup> Authorities consulted: Researches of Woods and Baltzley; Upton's "Military Policy of the United States"; The German economists, Schmoller, Hotzsch, Vintzer, Unold, etc.; Report, 1915, War College division, General Staff U. S. Army.

extended, upon those intrusted with the trusteeship duties of American citizenship; duties depending primarily upon the maintenance of the entity of this nation and of its principles. Upon this point of maintenance there is no difference of opinion, but as to the method there is a wide divergence. There are those who would have us continue in our present almost physical defenseless condition; there are those who believe in physical preparedness for national self-defense. Thus a present vital issue is clearly joined between these two methods, and the court of arbitrament is the public opinion of our citizenship.

Let us return to the days of Yorktown and ascertain what was believed by our forefathers. The revolution determined the American people could fight. The immediately succeeding years were to determine if what had been created could be maintained. It required six wretched years under the Confederation after Yorktown to bring them to the second crisis. In the adoption of the Constitution of 1789, the American people finally demonstrated their belief in the principles for which they had contested and accepted an instrument of power under which in succeeding years, nationality was to develop. In the preamble of this marvelous document of our forefathers, six reasons for their action are set forth, namely, union, justice, tranquillity, common defense, general welfare and liberty. While five of the six are dependent on force for effectiveness, let us briefly consider only the "common defense."

I believe it is both an opportune time and an advisable time for the subject to be considered in the forum of any assembled body of American citizens, for there are at the present time some sixty "peace-at-any-price," anti-armament and anti-enlistment societies arrayed in an active anti-preparedness campaign against this provision of physical "common defense." This is a subject of patriotism, not partisanship.

Our forefathers engaged in preparing the Constitution were very practical men, nearly all of them having been active participants in the revolution. Their leader was Washington, who, previously to his election as a delegate to the convention, and to his being elected its president, had given expression to a thought that can be considered as reflecting the sentiment of his associates on the subject:

It is a maxim founded on universal experience of mankind, that no nation is to be trusted further than it is bound by its interests, and no prudent statesman or politician will venture to depart from it.

Later, as president under the Constitution, he again expressed this same thought in the words:

There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not hopelessly lost by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it. If we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

In view of the expressions of so commanding a figure in contemporary thought and from one too who earnestly detested war, it is submitted as a reasonable inference that the makers of the Constitution realized their acts and with due deliberation referred, as one of the reasons for the adoption of the Constitution, to the necessity of a material self-defense for the nation. If this measure of "common defense" resting upon force was deemed necessary in the infancy of this then isolated republic, how much more so is it essential to-day, when modern inventions have eliminated time and distance; when we have as a nation, reached the position of a world power; when our possessions extend into both hemispheres, and when we have publicly announced certain international policies.

Against this assertion of unpreparedness, the radical pacifist, and I am referring alone to the "radical," as all thinking men are at heart pacifists as recognizing the horrors of war and deploring its existence—I repeat these radical pacifists vociferate that no nation is going to impair and disregard our national rights and honor, as this would be illogical; therefore no actual sufficient military or naval force is required for the protection of national entity or obligations, as reasoning is *per se* sufficient for self-defense.

Let us briefly analyze. The weakness of the argument is that the premises upon which it is based are conjectures. Who can assert with finality that no nation will attack us or seek to violate our national obligations? Has any radical pacifist the ability to absolutely ensure or guarantee the nation against such a result, as they venture to so positively assert is impossible? No, it is simply their personal opinion, to which they are entitled, even as those who deduct a different conclusion from events are entitled to their views.

Again, who is to determine whether war in the reasoning capacity of a nation appears as logical or illogical? These logicians of pacifism give us no practical guarantee that will comfortably ensure the acceptance of our reasoning as correct by other nations. Belgium invaded did not consider the action of Germany either reasonable or logical; but Germany did, and Belgium was devastated. Our logic has thus far failed to be unanimously accepted as correct by the warring factions in Mexico. While this theory is quite idealistic and desirable, both from a humanitarian and an economic standpoint, the vital question yet remains a simple one of reasoning, dependent on man as he is mentally and physically constituted in this twentieth century A.D., and not as he perhaps may become later through many centuries of evolution. I place emphasis upon man, as he is yet a creature influenced by self-interests and by human passions. It is man, who yet develops and guides the destinies and policies of nations; the personal equation still controls governments. Selfishness is yet a predominant human characteristic.

To return again to our ancestors, they thought they had reached after the close of the revolution, an idealistic state of man uncontrolled by enforceable law sustained by force, and it required the lawless and turbulent years between 1783 and 1789 to harshly demonstrate to the worthy descendants of Pilgrim, Puritan and Cavalier their error and release them from their thralldom of misery. As General Knox at this time wrote, "Men, actual men, possessing all the turbulent passions belonging to that animal, must have a government proper and adequate for him," and experience then was so fast demonstrating to our forefathers that an "adequate" government was one backed by physical power to enforce its mandates, that they adopted the Constitution of the United States as a "government of laws and not of men." What was then true as regards our domestic government remains true to-day as regards foreign relations, as we have yet no brotherhood of nations to correspond to our brotherhood of states controlled by a strong federal system resting upon a force sufficient to compel observance of its mandates. Our federation ends at our boundaries. Beyond lie different races with different interests and methods of thinking; different customs and forms of government. Each inspired and controlled by its interests, and by the passions of the men who are its active component parts. Who can prophetically foretell or foresee the latent motives that may at any time suddenly bring their principles impelled by so considered self-interests into direct conflict with those of this nation, with only war remaining as the court possessing jurisdiction over the issues raised. Treaties of arbitration are only enforceable like statute and constitutional laws when sustained by an enforcing power, otherwise they become "a scrap of paper."

I do not question the desirability of the pacifist plan; only its present availability. It will doubtlessly develop some time in later centuries. It has required over seven hundred years since Magna Charta for individual liberty and constitutional government in a few of the individual nations of the world to develop to its present imperfect state, for the system is still in a process of realization. Doubtlessly, when this form of government further spreads over the world, as it probably will, as democracy is elementally and historically progressive, the time will be approached when an international constitution of power may be evolved and a permanent union of nations under it rendered as possible and as practicable as is this Union of States under our Constitution. This is, though, of the far future, for despite the assertions of the rationalist philosophers of the pacifist school, men, apparently from recent events, are not yet governed much more by reason and logic and less by human passions than they were in past centuries. These philosophers, who so believe, I fear, are seated upon lofty heights and look over the heads of common human nature below.

We have founded here in this western world a republic, with its doors opened to all races and creeds, rich and poor, literate and illiterate, who have desired to seek personal liberty and opportunities beneath our flag. The duty of those of the present is to preserve these institutions of liberty and to transmit them to their successors in all purity. In so doing we will enlarge our influence in the world and hasten the advance of the ultimate establishment of a permanent international peace. God forbid that we Americans have reached that apathy of mind where it is folly to risk a hair for the mere idea of what some "fanatics" call one's country. Rather, let our youth continue to feel that an adequate defense is a noble duty. If not it is time to return to our Virgil,—"*Arma verumque cano*"—I sing of arms and the man. Rather this than "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier." No, if war is always wicked and peace beautiful, we must inexorably place George Washington and Abraham Lincoln in a class of murderous leaders and not as the creator and savior of the Union. Is this startling? It should not be. According to the logic of radical pacifism, the men who died on the battlefields of the Revolution and of the Civil War, irrespective of North or South, were not patriots, but rather men who went forth with murderous intent and as the deluded victims of unscrupulous leaders. I, for one, am not ready to accept any premises that lead to such an unholy conclusion. I can not see any valid reasons against an adequate, material self-defensive force for this nation. I can see many forcible reasons drawn from history and life of the imperative need for the security provided by such a proper force. I believe the great majority of American citizens are in favor of "common defense" as inheritors of the principles of the founders of this republic. If they had been "peace-at-any-price" men, they would have, after King George denied their petitions for redress, continued to peacefully lick the British stamps for affixation to their documents. This action would have avoided the revolution of '76 and probably involved our pacifist of the present in the current war as a colonist of Great Britain.

From the record of past events and from the observation of the present character of man, I can only logically deduce from these premises the necessity of physical self-defense. The methods of this preparedness I do not even assume to suggest. This is a question that we should wisely leave with those possessing the highest technical knowledge that the study of a lifetime can alone provide. There is only one question to be deliberately determined, without thought of partnership, only as Americans, by the citizens of this country, and that is physical preparedness, or unpreparedness.

Quite as essential as physical preparedness is the mental preparedness of the nation. This question arises more prominently at the present time because of the heterogeneous mingling of many races in our nation

and of the resulting concentration in recent years in our populous cities of these aliens in racial communities. Hitherto, the great amalgam which has fused into our body politic the many nationalities that have come to share our birthright, has been our common language. In racial districts where the inhabitants are using their native tongue, this language amalgam can not operate, and the alien, continuing to think and speak in native ways, is unassimilated. Obviously, such conditions constitute a menace to that complete unity of our people upon which must ultimately depend a mental preparedness from which must of necessity develop any effective physical preparedness.

Citizenship, whether by oath or by birth, demands loyalty to country. What is required in all is that spirit of loyalty that led Paul of Tarsus to exclaim, as bound and sentenced for scourging and an object of contempt, he brought consternation to the scarlet-clad Roman centurions in his acclamation, *Civis Romanus sum*—I am a Roman citizen—or of Patrick Henry in the halls of the Continental Congress, “I am not a Virginian, but an American.” It is a long step, through many centuries filled with the incessant struggles of mankind towards a higher degree of Christianity and civilization, from Paul in the *acra* to Patrick Henry in the Continental Congress, but the words of both, far beyond a mere oratorical expression, represent the very living spirit of political liberty that should thrill with vibrating impulses every citizen of this nation. This active consciousness of loyalty to principle, so essential to the homogeneity of any nation, can only be aroused by teaching our alien citizens through school, precept and example, our language, our methods of thinking and our standards of living; and to all, whether Americans by heritage or by oath, a reverence and love for our flag and a pulsating pride in the protection it affords and in the principles it symbolizes. In seeking this desired result, the thought must be kept distinctly in mind that the essence of a democracy is service to all the people within its precincts, and we must use our influence that such service will be rendered from which impulsively will spring loyalty to country. True patriotism is never an emotional sentiment produced by temporary exhortation; it is the result of a slow growth inspired by the thought that each possesses an interest in a government that serves and protects. It is this deep possessive feeling as to country that leads men to defend their heritage even at a sacrifice of life. It is the depth of this spirit that rallies a nation to unity of action in times of stress, sustained in the hours of adversity and leads it on to victory.

This subtle moral mobilization of the people is quite as essential to the security and permanency of a nation as is the outward physical preparedness of military training and supplies. It was this spirit of disciplined loyalty that gave Rome all its magnificent glory; gave its citizens their pride in the protection of their eagles; gave Paul the poor

tent-maker of Tarsus his exultation of spirit, and, when it failed, the Gothic hordes poured through the Salerian gate and Rome fell. It was this spirit that rallied the "Minute Men" at Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill, and brought the yeomanry of the colonies forward in every crisis of the revolution. It is a spirit closely akin to the spiritual feeling that distinguishes us from animals. It is the spirit upon which rests all that is worth while in this world of which we are a part in service to our democracy as representing our fellow-men. It is this national spirit that we must teach by word and by example with quickened conscience of the responsibility resting upon us. It presents an opportunity, both collectively and individually, to render national service to our country that we may, through living our own lives, justify our pride in the acts of the founders of this republic, at a time when alone service secured success.

The question we must each ask ourselves is:—Are we giving to our country the actual service for its advancement that we are capable of giving? Citizenship is a trusteeship. The pacifists who proclaim they are quite willing to take a chance on any nation attacking us are placing the future of the republic upon the forbearance of others, not upon the power to assert such a perpetuity. A plan hardly in accord with American traditions or the obligated duties of trusteeship. Again, these chance-taking pacifists overlook the salient fact that they can not separate themselves as individuals from citizens. To them has come, whether by heritage or by oath is immaterial, a life interest only in our government which protects them by its laws and institutions; and, like any life tenant, they have no right to so use this temporary individual interest as to imperil the principal in trust being transmitted intact to their successors. The fallacy of the endeavor to separate individuals and citizen interests is obvious. Rather may we turn to the heroic adherence of the citizens of Belgium to their obligations, even at the cost of war and devastation, as an inspiring example to the people of the United States. Citizenship carries duties of to-day, duties for the to-morrow. God grant that we may realize our opportunities and avail ourselves of the opportunity of service, zealously defending and continuing this republic, not only as a radiant promise, but as a full realization to all races of the world of a government of unity "of the people, by the people and for the people" under the principles represented by our glorious Stars and Stripes. God grant that we may continue to be inspired by the example of our forefathers in placing principle before all things, that we may not be led astray from our present opportunity of practical service to our country. Give us this mental preparedness backed by a proper defensive physical preparedness and this republic, sustained by the integrity, intelligence and conscience of the American people, will lead the way among all nations of the world to an ultimate federation of nations that through

democracy and the wisdom of a Divine Providence, will yet be created to bless all nations with an everlasting peace.

When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the battle-flags are furl'd  
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION

By HENRY H. WARD

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

THE "educators" of our country seem to have been among the last of the more intelligent body of the public to awaken to the necessity—even to the barest idea of the meaning—of national defense. I say "among the last," for among the more intelligent they are far from being alone in their apparent obliviousness to this vital public question.

However, in this attitude, the educator does stand as a most striking figure, in view of the particular relation which he holds to the public, as one whose profession is to impart pure knowledge on whatever subject. Apparently he has been little, if any, better informed than the average intelligent man of other professions. In fact, outside of the naval and military professions themselves, including, of course, the National Guard and Naval Militia, and outside of one or two heretofore struggling patriotic organizations, there is practically no scientific or consistent interest shown in this subject. Even our best informed men in civilian life, unless they have been brought into actual contact with naval and military administration, fail to recognize that here are two actual professions. Many of us so often pass them by with the idea that the army begins and ends in the few thousand men wearing uniforms and trained to a certain disregard of life, be it their own or that of others; the navy we look upon as little different from the army, except as it may be thought to differ in the matter of romance, or in the supposedly free and easy life of the sea and careless travel.

Now that the educator, along with other intelligent men, is awaking to the meaning of national defense, and to our country's need for it, his interest is becoming vivid and his activity dynamic. He stands forth potential for great national service, but not without some possibility for harm. There is, then, the greater need that he intelligently direct his efforts. The proselyte to the cause, be he educator or whoever he may be, starts out relatively ignorant of a vast subject. He learns a little, fails to realize the nature or extent of the subject before him, and, enthusiastic for this or that method or measure, not infrequently gives his energies along some misdirected line, or fails to realize full value from the energy that he expends.

There seems, too, to be a certain confusion, or lack of understanding, as to the alignment of public opinion, intelligent or otherwise, on the